

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/784,392		BOUCHER ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	ANDREW YANG		3775	

All Participants:

(1) ANDREW YANG

(2) RICHARD KONNEKER

Date of Interview: 30 December 2009

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

n/a

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

n/a

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Andrew Yang/
Examiner, Art Unit 3775

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 1:20pm

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called the attorney regarding the amendment of "nonremovably" and noted that the specification failed to support the amendment. It was cited in the applicant's remarks that page 5, line 30 of the specification supported the amendment. The attorney stated that the portion of the specification was wrongly cited and pointed to page 26, lines 4-6 that discloses heat bonding the stylet to the distal end of the second tubular member.